

Organization TC3600 Bldg./Room KNOX  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450


Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450

If Undeliverable Return In Ten Days

Official Business

Penalty For Private Use, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER




SCHW350\*X 220 N4C 1 3091 72 08/20/10  
FORWARD TIME EXP RTN TO SEND  
:JACK SCHWARTZ & ASSOCIATES  
243 5TH AVE RM 1902  
NEW YORK NY 10015-0718

RETURN TO SENDER

1001867715 0005  
22313@1450





# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/539,870

12/05/2005

Takamasa Iwaki

1083-9

6383

7590 08/20/2010  
Jack Schwartz & Associates  
Suite 1510  
1350 Broadway  
New York, NY 10018

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, SON T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3643

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/20/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/539,870	<b>Applicant(s)</b> IWAKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Son T. Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 3643	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Son T. Nguyen. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Keith McWha. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 17 August 2010.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: Mr. McWha brought in a sample of the invention and a sample of prior art for comparison. The prior art samples were flakes of plastic and wood materials for animal cage.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sugo (5641482) and Ito et al. (5939088).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Son T. Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3643	
--	--

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. McWha faxed the examiner proposed claims, to which the examiner does not believe the claims overcame the prior art of record. Mr. McWha argued that Sugo does not teach a flexible sheet that can be folded for the animal to hide in. The examiner stated that Sugo teaches a mat made of cellulose fabric from the carboxyl groups but not the specific detail how one can fold the mat to create crevasses for the animal to hide in, however, Ito et al. were combined with Sugo for the sheet being folded as shown clearly in Ito et al.'s fig. 4. Mr. McWha argued that Ito's sheet does not have soft members as added to the claim. The examiner stated that fig. 4 of Ito shows the sheet being divided in sections/portions, these sections/portions can be considered the soft members. Mr. McWha argued that Sugo does not teach the no less than 0.1 clo temperature holding property. The examiner stated that applicant's specification failed to disclose criticality to this range, thus, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art to have the sheet of Sugo as modified by Ito et al. with this temperature holding property range, depending on the desired temperture one wishes to have for the animal and depending on the animal. Mr. McWha argued that temperature holding property in this range is critical because figs. 4-5 of applicant's clearly show such importance. The examiner stated that figs. 4-5 do not show temperature holding property graph. Instead, figs. 4-5 show deodorizing property graph. Mr. McWha stated that if he incorporate deodorizing property range, would the case be in condition for allowance since Mr. McWha does not believe that Sugo teaches deodorizing property. The examiner stated that the whole invention of Sugo is about a deodorizing material for a mat, thus, clearly, Sugo teaches deodorizing property. In conclusion, Mr. McWha and the examiner did not agree on allowable subject matter.